

to consider the proposal of those who wish a Canada unarmed, both on sea and land, but who hope to substitute for them the British protection which it has enjoyed for years; the protection which is called by those who are not farsighted, the Monroe doctrine, and which is in a concrete form the recognition of the United States of America as the protector, the tutor, and the guardian of the twenty-one states of North, Central, and South America. The establishment of that Monroe doctrine, as a settled fact is contrary to the best interests of the world, as well as to the teaching of the society of states. There is but one, there can be but one, universal society of states. The Monroe doctrine has not proved itself, as you know, Sir, very useful to the lesser states of America. Mexico, which sought for the application of the Monroe doctrine to dethrone the Emperor Maximilian, lost through it, the best part of its territory. Mexico was deprived of her valleys and of her plains and she was left with but her mountains. The application of the Monroe doctrine too, in the case of Cuba, has proved very detrimental to the richest island of the West Indies. The secret conspiracy to destroy the sugar crops and the tobacco crops of Cuba and to create revolution against Spain, all things inspired by Monroe doctrine advocates, has brought, as its natural consequence the reduction of Cuba to a state of humiliating protection, and Porto Rico and the Philippine Islands to a still more inferior condition.

The intervention of our neighbours in the private affairs of the states of both central and south America, is not of a nature to encourage our country to place its future national aspirations under the protection of the Monroe doctrine. We are suffering enough just now, from the use by our neighbours of a name, though chosen by them at a Paris banquet, given in the honour of Franklin, which goes to show that our friends of the United States of America are arrogating to themselves alone the right to the name of Americans which should really designate all the groups of inhabitants of the whole continent. American invasion under a peaceful name has already set in, I regret to say. Very fortunately the other states have not yet recognized that abusive use of a name by the United States of America, which after all is but one of the forty-eight states of the world. Surely it is a most absurd dream to believe in the protection of the Monroe doctrine rather than in British protection.

Anything which will tend to loosen or to destroy our ties with the parent state is, in my opinion, an act of high treason towards our country, because it would mean for her a *Diminutio Capitis*, that is to say, a reduction of rank in the eyes of the world. Canada left to herself, without any

more British protection, would be open to be annexed to our neighbours, or to be sold to them, by her sovereign. We have to speak plainly; do you imagine, for a moment, that England, not receiving even the moral support or any co-operation in its defence from Canada, would do anything to protect the latter from an American or other foreign invasion? I have taken for granted, at this moment, that England would not try to coerce its colony of Canada. But it is within, as we have said, the power of England to resort to such coercion by way of taxation, threats of sale or exchange of territory, as in the case of Heligoland for Samoa, and the purchase of our territory would have an easy job to get possession of it. For, if those who do not wish our parliament to put up any defence should succeed in convincing our people of the correctness of their foolish opinions, Canada would be utterly unprotected both on sea and on land, and liable to be conquered by a border invasion. What are words of mouth worth against the bullet of the fusileer or the baton of the constable? I beg some of my Quebec friends to remember the days of 1837, when words, newspaper articles, and epistles from those having brought about the resort to arms, and who were keeping themselves in hiding in foreign lands, proved unequal to prevent my fellow-men from dying either on the battlefield or on the scaffold. Sir, I do not like to speak of those dire possibilities, should the opinion of those in my province who want an undefended Canada, prevail. Suppose that England inflicting chastisement, should disinterest herself of Canada; then in the case of annexation, for example, what would be the result for our church, our laws, and our language. Has any one thought of such a possibility? The treaty guarantees of 1763 would exist no more with regard to the use of our language, or the enjoyment of our civil laws, or with regard to the Catholic church, which would surely lose the privileges so long enjoyed by her. Surely, those institutions of ours, which are so dear to us all, would be in imminent danger, since say two senators, and four congressmen would represent the province of Quebec, provided—which is not certain—that the American states would accord the dignity of statehood to each of the provinces of Canada. However, it is quite possible that no such recognition of existing political divisions would take place, and that Canada would be governed by laws passed in Washington, without our having adequate representation there. I do not see why, if Canada, being either abandoned, or even sold or exchanged by England to the United States, the latter should not consider our country in the very same light as Porto Rico, and the Philip-